UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,762	08/06/2003	David S. Abdallah	PRIV-003/01US 1715 307640-2004	
	7590 12/02/200 DWARD KRONISH LI	EXAMINER		
ATTN: PATEN		GERGISO, TECHANE		
Suite 1100 777 - 6th Street, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001			2437	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/635,762	ABDALLAH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

		TESTIMILE OF SERVICES	2401	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE F	REPLY FILED <u>20 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
; ;	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coeriods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request	
a) [The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
b) [The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.)
have b under : set fort may re	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date seen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as	
	Γhe Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months of the date of	
f	iling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extended the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed working DMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a	ì
(The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, a) They raise new issues that would require further cob) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or d) They present additional claims without canceling a	tter form for appeal by materially rec		
,	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		scied claims.	
4. □	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
5. 🔲	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		,	
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be almon-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	•	
	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) now the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 15-21, 23-29, 32-36 and 38-52. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an explanation of	
	AVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	it before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered it or other evidence is necessary and	
(The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a	
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio EST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.	
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:	
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	manuel L. Moise/ ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437			

Continuation of 13. Other: The examiner considered the After Final filed on November 20, 2008 in response to the Final Office Action mailed on August 20, 2008. The applicant argues to overcome the 35 USC 112 and 103 rejections by reciting paragraph [0081-0083] to support the rejected elements. The examiner disagrees with the applicant's argument and analysis for the following reasons. Disclosing broadly in the spec "disabling functionality within the personal identification device" and claiming specific features "disabling functionality within the personal identification device except that identification device is configured to send the digital certificate to an enrollment part during future enrollment" without support in the spec are not the same or equivalent. Claim 23's scope adds the features ("except that identification device is configured to send the digital certificate to an enrollment part during future enrollment") not enabled or suggested in the spec. Again the applicant equates in claim 28 features enabled by the spec ("the apparatus, the processor configured to receive a digital certificate from the manufacturer party based on the first identifier) with claimed features ("the processor configured to disable functionality of the memory and the processor associated with a party other than an enrollment party") not suggested in the spec implicitly or explicitly. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, the applicant's argument are not persuasive to overcome the prior art in record to place independent claims in condition for allowance..